

hundred thousand people who are in this country illegally.

Yes, there are some heart-tearing cases here. Yes, some people who are in this country end up marrying American citizens, and the American citizens find that their loved one is going to have to go back to their home country in order to be here legally, because they have married an illegal alien. I am sorry, if someone is here illegally and they are going to have to go back, then they should go back to their home country to regularize their status.

Tomorrow, on H.R. 1885, we are, for hundreds of thousands of people, going to be basically granting them the right to amnesty without going to their home country to legalize their status. This does nothing but encourage the millions, and we are talking about tens of millions, of people who are standing in line throughout the world waiting to come into this country legally so they can become citizens; but we have done nothing but encourage them to come here illegally, to reward the law-breakers, and to punish those people who are following the law.

This is ridiculous. Our colleagues should consider this and vote against the suspension tomorrow on the bill, H.R. 1885.

By the way, let me note that there has been a recent poll by Mr. Zogby, who is one of America's most respected pollsters, which has found out some interesting things about America's attitude toward amnesty.

Most Americans think amnesty is a terrible idea. In fact, 55 percent of all Democrats think it is a bad idea; 56 percent of Republicans; 60 percent of union households; 45 percent of people who call themselves liberals; 59 percent of people who call themselves moderates; 61 percent of people who call themselves conservatives. And here is the real hook, here is the real bell-ringer: 51 percent of all Hispanics in the United States believe that amnesty for illegal immigrants is a bad idea.

We have been lied to over and over again, and so much so that the Republican party has not had the courage to stand up and oppose illegal immigration, as we should have.

The Democratic Party has made its deal with the illegal immigrants at the expense of the standard of living of our poorest citizens and at the expense of the wages that have been kept just level because we have had a massive flow of illegal immigrants into this country. The Democratic Party has made its deal for political power's sake.

The Republicans, on the other hand, will not touch the illegal immigration issue because they are afraid to be called racist. They have been told over and over again that Mexican-Americans, Hispanic Americans, are in favor of illegal immigrants, for some reason. That is absolutely not true. We have finally got a pollster who has done a legitimate poll to show that Hispanic Americans, just like all other Ameri-

cans, oppose illegal immigration. That is understandable.

Tomorrow we will have our chance to vote against an amnesty program for illegal immigrants by voting against H.R. 1885, which will be coming on the floor.

STATUS REPORT ON CURRENT SPENDING LEVELS OF ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FY 2001 AND THE 5-YEAR PERIOD FY 2002 THROUGH FY 2006

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, to facilitate the application of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act and section 201 of the conference report accompanying H. Con. Res. 83, I am transmitting a status report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal year 2002 and for the five-year period of fiscal years 2002 through 2006. This status report is current through September 5, 2001.

The term "current level" refers to the amounts of spending and revenues estimated for each fiscal year based on laws enacted or awaiting the President's signature.

The first table in the report compares the current levels of total budget authority, outlays, and revenues with the aggregate levels set forth by H. Con. Res. 83. This comparison is needed to enforce section 311(a) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the budget resolution's aggregate levels. The table does not show budget authority and outlays for years after fiscal year 2002 because appropriations for those years have not yet been considered.

The second table compares the current levels of budget authority and outlays for discretionary action by each authorizing committee with the "section 302(a)" allocations made under H. Con. Res. 83 for fiscal year 2002 and fiscal years 2002 through 2006. "Discretionary action" refers to legislation enacted after the adoption of the budget resolution. This comparison is needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the section 302(a) discretionary action allocation of new budget authority for the committee that reported the measure. It is also needed to implement section 311(b), which exempts committees that comply with their allocations from the point of order under section 311(a).

The third table compares the current levels of discretionary appropriations for fiscal year 2002 with the "section 302(b)" suballocations of discretionary budget authority and outlays among Appropriations subcommittees. The comparison is also needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act because the point of order under that section equally applies to measures that would breach the applicable section 302(b) suballocation.

The fourth table gives the current level for 2003 of accounts identified for advance appropriations in the statement of managers accompanying H. Con. Res. 83. This list is needed to enforce section 201 of the budget resolution, which creates a point of order against appropriation bills that contain advance appropriations that are: (i) not identified in the state-

ment of managers or (ii) would cause the aggregate amount of such appropriations to exceed the level specified in the resolution.

The fifth table compares discretionary appropriations to the levels provided by section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985. If at the end of a session discretionary spending in any category exceeds the limits set forth in section 251(c) (as adjusted pursuant to section 251(b)), a sequestration of amounts within that category is automatically triggered to bring spending within the establish limits. As the determination of the need for a sequestration is based on the report of the President required by section 254, this table is provided for informational purposes only. The sixth and final table gives this same comparison relative to the revised section 251(c) limits envisioned by the budget resolution.

REPORT TO THE SPEAKER FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET: STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2002 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ADOPTED IN H. CON. RES. 83, REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF SEPTEMBER 5, 2001

[On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2002	Fiscal years 2002-2006
Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority	1,627,934	n.a.
Outlays	1,590,617	n.a.
Revenues	1,638,202	8,878,506
Current Level:		
Budget Authority	977,964	n.a.
Outlays	1,198,811	n.a.
Revenues	1,672,152	8,897,349
Current Level over (+)/under (-) Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority	-649,970	n.a.
Outlays	-391,806	n.a.
Revenues	33,950	18,843

n.a.—Not applicable because annual appropriations Acts for fiscal years 2003 through 2006 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

BUDGET AUTHORITY

Enactment of measures providing new budget authority for FY 2002 in excess of \$649,970,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2002 budget authority to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 83.

OUTLAYS

Enactment of measures providing new outlays for FY 2002 in excess of \$391,806,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2002 outlays to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 83.

REVENUES

Enactment of measures that would result in revenue loss for FY 2002 in excess of \$33,950,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause revenues to fall below the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 83.

Enactment of measures resulting in revenue loss for the period FY 2002 through 2006 in excess of \$18,843,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause revenues to fall below the appropriate levels set by H. Con. Res. 83.

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION: COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR DISCRETIONARY ACTION, REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF SEPTEMBER 5, 2001

[Fiscal years, in millions of dollars]

House Committee	2002		2002-2006 total	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
Agriculture:				
Allocation	7,350	7,350	7,350	7,350
Current Level	0	2	0	0

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION: COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR DISCRETIONARY ACTION, REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF SEPTEMBER 5, 2001—Continued

[Fiscal years, in millions of dollars]				
House Committee	2002		2002–2006 total	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
Difference	–7,350	–7,348	–7,350	–7,350
Armed Services:				
Allocation	146	146	398	398
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	–146	–146	–398	–398
Banking and Financial Services:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	8	9	46	47
Difference	8	9	46	47
Education and the Workforce:				
Allocation	5	5	32	32
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	–5	–5	–32	–32
Commerce:				
Allocation	2,687	2,687	–6,537	–6,537
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	–2,687	–2,687	6,537	6,537
International Relations:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION: COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR DISCRETIONARY ACTION, REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF SEPTEMBER 5, 2001—Continued

[Fiscal years, in millions of dollars]				
House Committee	2002		2002–2006 total	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
Difference	0	0	0	0
Government Reform:				
Allocation	0	0	–1,995	–1,995
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	1,995	1,995
House Administration:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Resources:				
Allocation	0	–3	365	88
Current Level	0	–3	0	–3
Difference	0	0	–365	–91
Judiciary:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Small Business:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION: COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR DISCRETIONARY ACTION, REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF SEPTEMBER 5, 2001—Continued

[Fiscal years, in millions of dollars]				
House Committee	2002		2002–2006 total	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
Difference	0	0	0	0
Transportation and Infrastructure:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Science:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Veterans' Affairs:				
Allocation	264	264	3,205	3,205
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	–264	–264	–3,205	–3,205
Ways and Means:				
Allocation	1,360	900	15,409	15,069
Current Level	6,425	6,425	36,708	36,708
Difference	5,065	5,525	21,299	21,639

DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2002: COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE 302(B) SUBALLOCATIONS
[In millions of dollars]

Appropriations Subcommittee	Revised 302(b) suballocations as of July 26, 2001 (H. Rept. 107–165)		Current level reflecting action completed as of September 5, 2001		Current level minus suballocations	
	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT
Agriculture, Rural Development	15,668	16,044	13	4,257	–15,655	–11,787
Commerce, Justice, State	38,541	38,905	41	12,755	–38,500	–26,150
National Defense	300,209	293,697	0	96,349	–300,209	–197,348
District of Columbia	382	401	0	48	–382	–353
Energy & Water Development	23,705	24,218	1	8,798	–23,704	–15,420
Foreign Operations	15,168	15,087	0	9,569	–15,168	–5,518
Interior	18,941	17,800	36	6,145	–18,905	–11,655
Labor, HHS & Education	119,725	106,224	18,824	69,596	–100,901	–36,628
Legislative Branch	2,892	2,918	0	432	–2,892	–2,486
Military Construction	10,152	9,447	0	6,512	–10,152	–2,935
Transportation ¹	14,893	53,817	20	32,669	–14,873	–21,148
Treasury-Postal Service	17,021	16,292	340	3,727	–16,681	–12,565
VA-HUD-Independence Agencies	85,434	88,069	3,509	49,803	–81,923	–38,266
Unassigned	15	0	0	0	–15	0
Grand total	662,746	682,919	22,784	300,660	–639,962	–382,259

¹ Does not include mass transit BA.

STATEMENT OF FY2003 ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS UNDER SECTION 201 OF H. CON. RES. 83, REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF SEPTEMBER 5, 2001

[In millions of dollars]	
	Budget authority
Appropriate Level	23,159
Current Level:	
Commerce, Justice, State Subcommittee:	
Patent and Trademark Office	0
Legal Activities and U.S. Marshals, Antitrust Division	0
U.S. Trustee System	0
Federal Trade Commission	0
Interior Subcommittee: Elk Hills	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee:	
Employment and Training Administration	0
Health Resources	0
Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program	0
Child Care Development Block Grant	0
Elementary and Secondary Education (reading excellence)	0
Education for the Disadvantaged	0
School Improvement	0
Children and Family Services (head start)	0
Special Education	0
Vocational and Adult Education	0
Treasury, General Government Subcommittee:	
Payment to Postal Service	0
Federal Building Fund	0
Veterans, Housing and Urban Development Subcommittee:	
Section 8 Renewals	0
Total	0
Current Level Over (+) / under (–) Appropriate Level	–23,159

COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL TO DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LEVELS SET FORTH IN SECTION 251(c) OF THE BALANCED BUDGET AND EMERGENCY DEFICIT CONTROL ACT OF 1985, REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF SEPTEMBER 5, 2001

[In millions of dollars]				
	Statutory cap ¹	Current level	Current level over (+)/under (–) statutory cap	
General Purpose	BA 546,945	22,784	–524,161	
Defense ²	OT 537,383	274,511	–262,872	
BA	n.a.	3	n.a.	
OT	n.a.	107,951	n.a.	
Nondefense ²	BA	22,781	n.a.	
OT	n.a.	166,560	n.a.	
Highway Category	BA	n.a.	n.a.	
OT	28,489	20,432	–8,057	
Mass Transit Category	BA	n.a.	n.a.	
OT	5,275	5,093	–182	
Conservation Category	BA	1,760	–1,760	
OT	1,232	624	–608	

n.a.=Not applicable.

¹ Established by OMB Sequestration Update Report for Fiscal Year 2002.

² Defense and nondefense categories are advisory rather than statutory.

COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL TO DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LEVELS RECOMMENDED BY H. CON. RES. 83, REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF SEPTEMBER 5, 2001

[In millions of dollars]				
	Proposed statutory cap ¹	Current level	Current level over (+)/under (–) proposed statutory cap	
General Purpose	BA 660,986	22,784	–638,202	
OT	647,923	274,511	–373,412	

COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL TO DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LEVELS RECOMMENDED BY H. CON. RES. 83, REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF SEPTEMBER 5, 2001—Continued

[In millions of dollars]				
	Proposed statutory cap ¹	Current level	Current level over (+)/under (–) proposed statutory cap	
Defense ¹	BA n.a.	3	n.a.	
OT	n.a.	107,951	n.a.	
Nondefense ¹	BA	22,781	n.a.	
OT	n.a.	166,560	n.a.	
Highway Category	BA	n.a.	n.a.	
OT	28,489	20,432	–8,057	
Mass Transit Category	BA	n.a.	n.a.	
OT	5,275	5,093	–182	
Conservation Category	BA	1,760	–1,760	
OT	1,232	624	–608	

n.a.=Not applicable.

¹ Defense and nondefense categories are advisory rather than statutory.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, September 6, 2001.

Hon. JIM NUSSLE,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2002 budget and is current through September 5, 2001. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of H.

Con. Res. 83, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2002. The budget resolution figures incorporate revisions submitted by the Committee on the Budget to the House to reflect funding for emergency requirements. These revisions are required

by section 314 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

Since my last letter dated July 12, 2001, the Congress has cleared and the President has signed the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2001 (P.L. 107-20), which changed budget au-

thority and outlays for 2002. The effects of this new law are identified in the enclosed table.

Sincerely,

BARRY B. ANDERSON
(For Dan L. Crippen, Director).

FISCAL YEAR 2002 HOUSE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT AS OF SEPTEMBER 5, 2001

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget au- thority	Outlays	Revenues
Enacted in previous sessions:			
Revenues	0	0	1,703,488
Permanents and other spending legislation	984,540	934,501	0
Appropriation legislation	0	280,919	0
Offsetting receipts	-321,790	-321,790	0
Total, previously enacted	662,750	893,630	1,703,488
Enacted this session:			
An act to provide reimbursement authority to the Secretaries of Agriculture and the Interior from wildland fire management funds (P.L. 107-13)	0	-3	0
Fallen Hero Survivor Benefit Fairness Act of 2001 (P.L. 107-15)	0	0	-7
Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 (P.L. 107-16)	6,425	6,425	-31,337
An act to clarify the authority of the Department of Housing and Urban Development with respect to the use of fees (P.L. 107-18)	8	9	8
An act to authorize funding for the National 4-H Program Centennial Initiative (P.L. 107-19)	0	2	0
Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2001 (P.L. 107-20)	65	4,576	0
Total, enacted this session	6,498	11,009	-31,336
Entitlements and Mandatories: Budget resolution baseline estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs not yet enacted	308,716	294,172	0
Total Current Level	977,964	1,198,811	1,672,152
Total Budget Resolution	1,627,934	1,590,617	1,638,202
Current Level Over Budget Resolution	0	0	33,950
Current Level Under Budget Resolution	-649,970	-391,806	0
Memorandum:			
Revenues, 2002-2006:			
House Current Level	0	0	8,897,349
House Budget Resolution	0	0	8,878,506
Current Level Over Budget Resolution	0	0	18,843

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

Notes: P.L.=Public Law.

Section 314 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended, requires that the House Budget Committee revise the budget resolution to reflect funding provided in bills reported by the House for emergency requirements, disability reviews, an Earned Income Tax Credit compliance initiative, and adoption assistance. To date, the Budget Committee has increased the budget authority allocation in the budget resolution by \$1,446 million, and the outlay allocation by \$143 million for these purposes. Those amounts are not included in the current level because the funding has not yet been enacted.

UNIQUE LEGISLATIVE ISSUES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, before I begin my Special Order this evening that will address unique legislative issues, I would like to join my colleague who spoke just a few moments ago to acknowledge the great loss of Chaplain Jim Ford, a very special friend to us all.

I am particularly privileged because Chaplain Ford visited my home district in Houston, the 18th Congressional District, and spoke at the pulpit of the church pastored by Reverend Willy Jones. That church is still riveted by the friendship shown by Chaplain Ford, the good humor, and the ability to interact with different faiths.

We know that he is among the angels, and we offer to him and his family our deepest sympathy and our deepest love.

Madam Speaker I wanted to address tonight several issues. First of all, let me do one that is particularly joyous for me in this time of technology and web pages and communications by e-mail.

Let me congratulate First Lady Laura Bush for an exciting weekend, which I am sorry that I missed; but I hope it will be captured around the Nation. That is the National Book Festival; 25,000 persons enjoyed literary art, enjoyed the reading of famous authors actually reading from books. I hope this will take off around the Nation so that this Nation never lacks its appreciation for the written word, for wonderful books written by our na-

tional authors. Let us do this around our Nation. I thank Laura Bush, the first lady, for an outstanding job.

Now, I hope that this viewpoint is one that will be based upon the concern for saving lives. In February of this year, 2001, I came to the floor of the House and acknowledged that I believe that the policy toward the Middle East by this administration is wrongheaded and misdirected. I said that because many times engagement in diplomacy is painful. Many times it results in failure. But it is often utilized as the only vehicle and only tool to save lives.

Much laughter and criticism was given to President Clinton in the last days of his administration as he engaged in shuttle diplomacy between Camp David and Washington, D.C. and the country of Israel. I did not find it humorous because it was an attempt to save lives.

Since we have disengaged with the Mideast, all that has resulted is the loss of lives, bloodshed for women, children, and men, both in the Palestinian people and in the Israeli people.

Can anyone believe that our disengagement has been victorious? Does anyone believe in reality that one can stand off to the corner and point fingers and tell "those guys" to get to the table of empowerment and peace? No. It is well known that the United States carries a heavy stick with respect to these particular countries, and it also is well known that the United States' good will is very important in bringing these two disparate worlds together.

Day after day after day, Arab militants and then Israelis on the other side are engaging in a bloody battle. This is a war. This has accelerated to

more than a conflict. I believe our foreign policy on this issue is wrong.

It pains me, as we move to some of the humblest and most sacred times in the Jewish community here in the United States and across the world, two of their most important holidays over the next 2 to 3 weeks in the United States will be honored, and of course in Israel and around the world. Would it not be a wonderful tribute then to say that we are reengaged, that we want to save lives, that we want them to come to the peace table, and we say, "Stop the accusations, Arafat come to the table, Sharon come to the table, release yourselves from the strictures of hatred, and begin to talk about real issues of saving lives and living harmoniously together"?

I believe this is an enormously important issue and would ask the President and the administration and his advisers to wake up and understand the importance of U.S. involvement.

Let me conclude by answering my colleague's comments on 245(i). As the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims, it is wrong headed to interpret this particular legislative initiative as a general amnesty. All it is is because the Immigration and Naturalization Service made a mistake. They made a mistake with a date, they made a mistake administratively.

This is simply to allow those who are in the process of filing for legalization 10, 15 years ago, to reactivate their applications.

□ 1900

Many of these people are family members who need to be reunited. Many of these people come from many